

AFRICA DIGEST

VOLUMES

1-4

1952 - 1957



1

Information Digest



NO. 1.

JULY, 1952

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>SPECIAL ISSUE ON CENTRAL AFRICAN FEDERATION.</u>	
1. LETTER FROM REV. MICHAEL SCOTT	1
2. HOW STRONG IS AFRICAN OPPOSITION TO FEDERATION?	3
3. DEBATES ON FEDERATION - NORTHERN RHODESIA	5
SOUTHERN RHODESIA	6
U.K. (for readers abroad)	6A
4. REACTIONS TO THE WHITE PAPER ON FEDERATION	
(a) Comments in Central Africa	7
(b) African opinion	7
(c) South African Opinion	8
(d) West African Opinion	9
(e) British Press Opinion	9
5. WEST AFRICA - COMMENTS ON A SERIES OF ARTICLES ON THE GOLD COAST PUBLISHED IN THE "DAILY TELEGRAPH" - by LORD HEMINGFORD	12

For - ACCOUNT OF ACTIVITIES OF
THE AFRICA BUREAU

P.T.O....

Published by THE AFRICA BUREAU
69 GREAT PETER STREET
LONDON S.W.1 (Abbey 4946)

Honorary Presidents: MISS MARY ATTLEE, THE VERY REV. PRINCIPAL JOHN
BAILLIE, SIR MAURICE BOWRA, JAMES CRAWFORD, THE
RT. HON. ISAAC FOOT, LADY HEMINGFORD, THE RT. REV.
W. J. HUGHES, PROFESSOR ARTHUR LEWIS, MISS VIOLET
MARKHAM, THE REV. PROF. C. E. RAVEN, THE REV. DR.
W. E. SANGSTER

Executive Committee: LADY PAKENHAM (*Chairman*), LORD HEMINGFORD, THE
RT. HON. A. CREECH JONES, JOHN H. MACCALLUM-SCOTT,
THE REV. MICHAEL SCOTT

THE AFRICA BUREAU - ACCOUNT OF ACTIVITIES

- ** On the 26th June, the Africa Bureau was formally launched at a Press Conference in Church House. The Manchester Guardian (27 June) wrote: "It is no surprise to find that the Africa Bureau, which has been organised to provide a channel for Anglo-African contacts and to distribute expert information on African subjects, includes on its committee Mr. Creech Jones and Mr. Michael Scott. But at a press conference today the most authoritative voice was that of Lord Hemingford, who has spent so long in Africa that he is not widely known here. Early in the proceedings he declared himself a Conservative, which was of help to the chairman, Lady Pakenham, when she was insisting on the non-party basis of the bureau. The treasurer is a Liberal. . . Lord Hemingford.. was a master at Achimota College from 1926-1939. He left the Gold Coast for a time to take on the headship of a school in Uganda and then returned to Achimota as head of the teachers' training college."

The Times wrote (27 June): "Criticism of the Government's White Paper on Central African Federation was made in London yesterday by Mr. Creech Jones, a former Colonial Secretary, when he spoke at a Press Conference on behalf of the Africa Bureau, an organisation which seeks to focus attention on African affairs. He thought the safeguards envisaged in the proposals.. would not last long in a Federal Assembly where the influence would perhaps be predominantly European.."

- ** On the 25th June, members of the Bureau, together with Mr. C.W.W. Greenidge, secretary of the Anti-Slavery Society, Rev. Kenneth MacKenzie, Church of Scotland missionary from Northern Rhodesia, and Dr. Kenneth Little, Reader in Social Anthropology at Edinburgh, waited on the Secretaries of State for Commonwealth Relations and the Colonies and conveyed a resolution passed by a Delegates Conference on 3 May, to the effect that the British people should in no way allow "their responsibilities for the Central African territories to be diminished without the full consent of the African inhabitants, and that federation ..shall not be imposed on them."

The Ministers replied to the statements made and said that before a decision was made efforts would be made to ascertain the opinion of all sections of the populations in the territories.

- ** Members of the Bureau have also had discussions with various members of Parliament and of the House of Lords.
- ** On 1 July the Bureau held a meeting with representatives of other organisations, including the Liberal International, Liberal Party, Trades Union Congress, National Council of Women, Racial Unity, Chemical Workers Union, Church Missionary Society, Crusade for World Government, Commission of the Churches on International Affairs, Student Christian Movement, Friends International Centre, Christian Action, British Council of Churches, Union of Democratic Control, Congress of Peoples Against Imperialism, Federal Union, to discuss the Bureau's aims, and the question of federation.
- ** Requests for speakers at meetings in various parts of the British Isles have been received, and a panel of speakers is to be formed.
- ** Two pamphlets will shortly be published, on Central Africa - one on the constitutional proposals by the Rt.Hon. A. Creech Jones, and the other by Patrick O'Donovan, on a practical project in agriculture by both black and white. These pamphlets are offered as stimulants to thought and action by people of all races who want to find an answer to a very complex problem. They will not offer a remedy for all ills, but suggest the lines along which a happier solution might be found, given the will to find it. It is hoped that they may provide some basis for discussion and criticism both in Britain and Africa, and that out of this process something more acceptable to the conscience of Britain and to the peoples of Africa may emerge.
-

THE AFRICA BUREAU

69 Great Peter Street,
London, S.W.1.

INFORMATION DIGEST

ABBEY 4946.

Special issue on Central African FederationJuly 1952.

The Central Africa question is now moving into a decisive phase. Both for Britain and Africa the decision reached on this matter will have far-reaching and irrevocable consequences. No one should be deceived by talk of a 'constitutional experiment'. It is not possible to experiment with a people's trust in this way. Groundnuts may be written off as a loss if the experiment fails and something else tried instead; but with human beings a failure of this magnitude would produce so much bitterness that no second chance for peaceful development would be possible.

That this is becoming more and more appreciated in Britain is clear from the debate in the House of Lords and from the controversy which is still going on in the British and African press. It has now been taken up by the B.B.C. in a series of talks on partnership by well-known authorities, such as Lord Hailey and Professor Arthur Lewis. All this is increasing the British people's awareness both of the dangers and of the opportunities which face Britain in Africa.

Inevitably in a controversy in which the future of whole communities is at stake the stress and tensions are mounting. Opinions react strongly upon one another. And in the heat of the battle of words things are said which may afterwards be regretted but which nevertheless reveal some of the true trends of thought and feeling.

The suspicion in the minds of many Africans is that the Federation scheme is a device of the white settlers to consolidate their political domination before Africans can achieve a fair political representation. This has, of course, led to a counter claim on the African side that government in these territories should be by Africans for Africans.

As a number of missionaries in Central Africa forecast the federation controversy is arousing suspicions and engendering racial passions and recriminations which inevitably deepen the cleavage along racial lines. In these circumstances it falls to the lot of Britain to grasp the reins of responsibility which are still in her hands and not to allow the initiative in Central Africa to be snatched from her grasp.

In the minds of some, firmness in leadership means imposing a policy by force, and there are people in Britain and in Central Africa who would like Federation to be imposed by force. They are in a minority but they wield great influence.

On the other hand there are also in Britain many who, like Lord Hailey, have learned through Britain's experience in Asia to respect the opinions and wishes of indigenous peoples, even when at times these appear to be being driven into extreme forms of expression.

If Africa is not to prove the graveyard of Britain's hopes of a multi-racial commonwealth, clearly now is the time for statesmanship and for the exercise of full responsibility by Britain in face of what may be a strong temptation in troubled times to abdicate in favour of insistent local settlers' demands for 'self-government'.

So far the initiative in this matter of working out constitutional reforms has been taken by the white officials and politicians on the spot, and this fact, taken with the fatal failure to confide in Africans at the beginning, has been responsible for African suspicion mounting into positive hostility. The threat now of imposition, after African opinion

has/...

has been belatedly invited and definitely expressed as being against the scheme, and the use of Government officials and machinery to attempt to persuade the Africans to accept it, may make extremely difficult the task of working out any possible alternatives to federation.

Statesmanship of a high order is therefore now demanded of Britain. Her own genius and the lessons she can confidently claim to have learned from her own internal and colonial history should make her equal to the tasks.

Similarly for the Africans of these territories this is a test. For the first time they must face a major crisis with the eyes of all the world watching them.

The British Government should discontinue its present plans. Its first duty should then be to give the Africans a full and fair opportunity to make their views known not necessarily in the context of official conferences on Federation. Its second duty should be to make sure that despite the boycott of the official conferences by the Africans both sides of this dispute do know each others' attitude. If people are to live together they must be able to face one another's arguments. Finally the British Government must not abandon its primary responsibility for the fate of these areas and peoples.

The Africans can count on the sympathy of the world and in particular of British public opinion if they can press their case with moderation and without bitterness. Bitter words, whether they come from the European or the African side, may lose the sympathy of the world for the case they advocate.

The African leaders have a supremely difficult task. They must struggle for the fair treatment of their own oppressed people without making the mistakes of their opponents by basing their appeal on race feeling.

The happiness of these territories now, the removal of racial and other barriers to progress, and the future peace of coming generations will depend very largely on the words and actions of responsible leaders now. There is no short cut to establishing confidence, but the patient work of generations can easily be lost by one false step, whether by the local white or African community or by the British Government in a matter of such magnitude and importance for Africa as this question.

2. HOW STRONG IS AFRICAN OPPOSITION TO FEDERATION?

One of the points most frequently argued in the debates on Central African federation is the question of the strength of African opposition. Here are some points on which the reality of African opposition may be judged:

- (a) Both the Protectorate Council of Nyasaland and the African Representative Council of Northern Rhodesia - the two major bodies created by Government for the purpose of consulting African opinion, and which include a majority of chiefs - have practically unanimously opposed any further consideration of the Federation proposals.
- (b) J.Z. SAVANHU and J.M. NKOMO, the two African delegates who formed part of the Southern Rhodesian delegation to the conference in London in April, made the following comments on their return to Southern Rhodesia: (The Rhodesia Herald, June 23, 1952.) The Federation proposal will not be acceptable to the Africans of Southern Rhodesia until there is complete and true partnership. Mr. NKOMO said "The present proposals show that Federation would be only for Europeans." The African people did not refuse this Federation without knowing anything about it. They wanted real partnership... Discriminatory legislation had made them lose faith in the white man. The Land Apportionment Act was an instance of discrimination. Africans were not allowed to own property in urban areas, and they were moved from the land where they were living. There was also discrimination in giving posts to Africans in Government Departments. Apart from discriminatory legislation, there was an unwritten law that assumed that Africans were inferior to Europeans.
- (c) These are extracts from some of the speeches made in the Northern Rhodesian Legislative Council during the debate on the Federation White Paper:

MR. BUSH (Secretary for Native Affairs) said he disagreed with people who claimed that the opposition was confined to a vociferous minority. The reason for the vast majority being against federation was the ultra-conservatism of the African and his fear of the unknown. On top of this, the effects of federation had been greatly misrepresented.

THE REV. E.G. NIGHTINGALE (Government nominee to represent African Interests) said he was anxious that justice be done to the reality of African opposition even though it was felt to be based upon misapprehension. He added that to brush African opinion lightly aside would be a tragic mistake for Northern Rhodesia. Referring to opinions expressed on the matter by the British Council of Churches, he said that body had stated that if it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government, or any other people to force through a proposal which was strongly opposed by large numbers of people who had no adequate means of enforcing their will in the political sphere, then the proposal ceased to be a political one and became an ethical one.

MR. JOHN MOFFAT (Senior Member for African Interests) said that a number of efforts had been made to get round the factor of African opposition by declaring firstly that opposition did not exist or was greatly exaggerated; secondly that African opinion had been gravely misled and thirdly that it was completely misinformed. "These devices carry no weight with me because on the evidence I have available the first contention is not true, the second is not material and the third could be remedied by instruction."

- (d) THE REV. ANDREW B. DOIG (Member of the Legislative Council of Nyasaland and Secretary of the Blantyre Mission Council) has said "The Africans are absolutely united. Any attempt to suggest that only a few hotheads are stirring up all the trouble, or that African opinion is divided, or that they say no without understanding is sheer folly."

The Bishop/...

- (e) The BISHOP OF CHICHESTER quoted the most prominent French Protestant Missionary living who had just returned from a visit to Northern Rhodesia. He saw the Paramount Chief of Barotseland and many Chiefs and many Africans, and he summed up his judgement: "There are no more devoted subjects of the Queen in any part of the British Empire than the Africans. They are loyal to the Court. They go back to the great Queen Victoria and to the Treaties made with her, on which they absolutely rely. But they are as one man against federation." (House of Lords Hansard for 2 July 1952.)
- (f) SIR GODFREY HUGGIA said (23 June) "I know there has been considerable objection to these proposals from certain sections of the Native African people. These objections must not be brushed aside but noted. They are largely inspired from outside Africa."

3. DEBATES ON FEDERATIONNORTHERN RHODESIA

The Legislative Council on July 4 and 5 debated a motion introduced by Mr. Roy Welensky asking the Council to take note of the White Paper on Federation. The following are brief extracts made from speeches in this debate:-

MR. WELENSKY said: "If we hope to make this country a home for people of both races, if we want to make it a happy and prosperous country, then we must completely divorce our politics from colour. We must endeavour to get our politics on economic lines and, if we fail in that I think we have failed in the whole problem". On the question of partnership he added, "Not all partnerships are 50-50. There have to be senior and junior partners and, for a long time I can see no change, but at the same time the African should make his contribution and, as he continues to make such contribution, so should his position in that partnership change".

MR. BUSH (Secretary for Native Affairs) said he looked forward to even greater federation, when the British states in East Africa joined with those of Central Africa under the Crown to add further to economic and political security. Replying to a statement made by one of the African members, Mr. Yamba, he said: "It is true that two thirds majority of Federal Assembly required to pass such amendment could be obtained if all Europeans voted for and only Africans voted against. But Mr. Yamba is assuming that divisions will be on racial lines. He is assuming that Europeans of the two Northern Territories would vote for amendment and I do not think that is a fair assumption".

MR. WILLIAMS (Chief Secretary) thought that there was a good deal to be said for gaining African support for the scheme, but he doubted if there was time for further delay.

The REV. E.G. NIGHTINGALE (African Interests) put forward a plea for patience, declaring that nothing but a most unhappy future would be in store if Federation was forced through while opposition remained as great as it was now. He said that Federation had received a very mixed reception in Southern Rhodesia, and Northern Rhodesian Africans had remained suspicious and afraid. He appealed to those who were most anxious that Federation should be established not to attempt to force it against such great opposition. "If Federation is as good a thing as it is believed to be" he declared "its own virtues will carry conviction, not only to the European community, but to the African". One reason for urgency of Federation that he had heard stated widely and repeatedly was that Southern Rhodesia was in a position to make an immediate choice between federation with the Northern Territories and incorporation into the Union of South Africa. If it were true that Southern Rhodesia was as near to entering the Union as that, Mr. NIGHTINGALE continued, would federation keep her out, or would the outcome be that the Northern Territories would be dragged into the Union of South Africa with Southern Rhodesia. If this fear was baseless, there was the question whether it would be possible to 'breathe freely' in the proposed Federal Government if the ideologies proclaimed and practised by the present South African Government did, in fact, achieve so much acceptance in Southern Rhodesia.

MR. G.B. BECKETT (Member for Agriculture and Natural Resources) admitted that the safeguards were not there for ever and a day. "The day must come" he added "when people in growing countries must be masters of their own fate and the masters of their own constitutions".

MR. JOHN MOFFAT (Senior Nominated Member representing African Interests) said that for the first time in history Africans were banding together for no other reason than that they were African. While he did not suggest that if federation was forced through there would inevitably be a permanent cleavage on racial lines for racial reasons, for the first time

a major/...

a major issue would have been settled on this racial basis - an issue which the African peoples would lose because Europeans had political power to force it through. "We shall have given ammunition to that element in the African population which is already preaching the doctrine that racialism is the only salvation for Africans in Central Africa. These persons will never forget this matter nor will they ever forgive you. The issue was this: granted in full measure all the substantial benefits which could be expected from federation, had the European minority the moral right to impose its will in a fundamental issue of this nature on the vast majority of African people who had indicated their opposition to it in terms which could not be misunderstood."

MR. P. SOKOTA (one of the two African Members) said that the entire African community was opposed to the plan because the prime mover of federation was Sir Godfrey Huggins who saw the plan as a stepping stone to amalgamation. Africans feared the extension of the Native policy of Southern Rhodesia whose policy approximated more closely to the Native policy of South Africa than to that in any other British African territory. The fact that settlers who wanted federation wished to entrench themselves in political domination in African territories before the African inhabitants were politically active, justified African fears. He continued, "I draw the attention of Her Majesty's Government that we are not at present sufficiently advanced politically to defend ourselves against the European minority without the assistance of impartial officials of the British Administration of the United Kingdom. We believe that Federation is a moral test for the British people."

SOUTHERN RHODESIA

During the debate in the Southern Rhodesian Parliament - 23-24 June MR. BEN FLETCHER (Minister for Native Affairs) said that the African Affairs Board would be the only reason why the referendum might go against Federation, and he thought the conference in October should nullify this proposal, and meet Southern Rhodesian wishes. The scheme could be strengthened by more orthodox constitutional safeguards. (according to The Times, 28 June 1952.)

SIR GODFREY HUGGINS said inter alia that the Colonial Office would have no control over the Federal Government - "the scheme in front of us now is for the emancipation of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland, and for the preservation of Southern Rhodesia." He added that the removal of London control was an advancement for the Northern territories, and Southern Rhodesia would go on as before except to the extent that it was surrendering certain powers to the Federal state. "The fact that educated Africans can be members of the Federal Parliament as soon as it is brought into being should be a great attraction to them" he said. "In the territorial legislature of Southern Rhodesia it will be a long time before they will have one of their own number to represent them, but under our system they are taking part as citizens of the Colony, learning all the time to work with us. This is essential because if, as the number of African voters increases, they indulge in colour politics and not national politics I am sure my descendants will take the vote on the common roll away from them and give them a communal system, which is group representation apart from the nation as a whole. The only way to prove to Africans in Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland that their opposition is wrong is to bring federation into being and then, by demonstration, they will see they are wrong and their fears groundless."

MR. I.D. SMITH (as reported in The Rhodesia Herald 27.6.52.) said that steps for a closer association should be made first, and if these proved successful then the country should look further north to the territories of Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika... and then later south to Bechuanaland. Then there should be a pause for consolidation before taking the final step which he did not think would come for some time. This final step was federation with the Union of South Africa... Going north was a necessary preliminary to going south.

MR. G.A. DAVENPORT (Minister of Mines, Transport and Education) said the experiment was worth-while and while it was being made the African Affairs Board would probably be necessary if only to reassure the Natives. If the people on the Board made a farce of it they could be replaced, and if the same thing happened a second time the Board would have to go.

UNITED KINGDOM - HOUSE OF LORDS

On 2 July LORD OCMORE said it would be a mistake if there were too much concentration upon the details of the White Paper Constitution. "Africans are not worried about the details at all, so far as I understand. They have a certain fear, and it is our duty, as a House of Parliament responsible for them, to study the reasons for their fear." Forcing federation through would be a betrayal of all that the British people stand for.

The BISHOP OF CHICHESTER said "The Churches have a particular claim to an interest in this matter" and quoted the resolution passed by the British Council of Churches in April. He described the weaknesses in the constitution which provided only 6 out of 35 seats for the great majority of the population, and transferred the vital subjects of immigration and higher education to the Federal Government.

The EARL OF LISTOWEL pointed out that Labour opinion, Liberal opinion and opinion in the Church of England took the same view, in broad outline, about this matter. "My own view, and I say it as a convinced supporter of federation, is that the Government would do well to withdraw these proposals now and not to ask for a verdict upon them at this stage. I do not think either that opinion in Central Africa is ready for federation or that federation is desirable so long as these three territories are at such different levels of social and political development." With regard to representation in the Federal Government, it was unlikely that African representation would be increased in the future for this could be done only by a two-thirds vote of the Legislative Assembly, which would be predominantly European. Another objectionable feature was the subordination of the Northern territories to Southern Rhodesia. Concerning safeguards he said "I think we must understand the European as well as the African point of view... because naturally they feel that they want to reach Dominion status... and they will be denied this because, under the proposed new Constitution the Home Government will always claim the right to vote legislation dealing either with the African population or with amendments to the Constitution. From the African point of view, these safeguards will not inspire confidence because Africans will fear that the first strong Federal Government will assert its independence and natural desire for Dominion status by by-passing the African Affairs Board and ignoring the protests of Whitehall."

The MARQUESS OF SALISBURY put forward the vital importance and urgency of federating the three countries for building up a strong British bloc, and for the economic interdependence of the three territories. Not only was it desirable to facilitate supplies of coal to the copper fields, but it would be of great benefit to harness the waters of the Zambesi gorges to the benefit of all. In the course of describing the advantages of the safeguards for Africans, he said that the most important functions of the African Affairs Board to many of those who had studied it was as follows. "Before a Bill is introduced into the Federal Assembly a copy must be sent to the Board, unless, first the Governor-General signifies that it is not in the public interest that the Bill should be published before its introduction - the obvious case is the Budget, which we know can never be heard by anyone but the Cabinet before it is actually introduced - or, secondly, that the Bill is too urgent for copy to be sent to the Board before introduction - the best example of that is a sudden and dangerous crisis in the affairs of the Federation." The Board also had power, subject to the approval of the Governor-General, to insist that any measure which in their opinion differentiated against Africans should be referred back to London for a final decision.

The EARL OF HUNAN pointed out that "Constitutional reform or change of electoral procedure takes place only on the initiative of the Federal Legislature... and it seems that that state of affairs is petrifying the present political system.... The time will come when some widening of the franchise or of the electoral system will become due - certainly it would become due if they were under the Colonial Office. But are they now to be prevented from any further progress?"

On the 7th July LORD AMMON said that "while everything possible seems to have been inserted in the draft to maintain the existing status and the existing rights of the coloured people, there is no provision whatever for their future freedom of development."

LORD MILVERTON said the real cause of opposition to federation "is the use which is being made of the fear of those many multitudes by a certain small number of people who are able to appeal to their racial emotions and get behind them the force of that fear". Like EARL WINTERTON and VISCOUNT HUFFSIDE, he questioned what African opinion was. "In a generic sense, there is really no such thing. African opinion is largely what the bulk of the people are told by a few politically minded and educated men... I suggest that today in Central Africa African opinion on this scheme represents largely the ambition of a few men." LORD BLACKFOLD said it was the opinion of "a few examination-bred students."

LORD WINSTER described forms of racial legislation in Southern Rhodesia and asked "How can these things be reconciled with partnership, or with what the Prime Minister has described as 'the total rejection of any policy of racial domination and suppression'? These are things with which the African is faced in his daily life. It is not fear of the unknown, as the noble lord, Lord Milverton, said, but fear of the known, the knowledge of the circumstances of his daily life, which operates in his mind..." "I believe that political reforms should precede federation, and that that is essential if the African is to have any confidence whatever in federation proposals, now or at any other time... What we have to guard against is mutual racial dislike. If we continue to humiliate the African in this way - and he is humiliated by these racial laws, and this discrimination and segregation - he will become possessed with a will to humiliate the European. The two races must learn to live and work together in equality, respecting each other's dignity. The alternative, to my mind, is racial hatred and catastrophe."

LORD HEMINGFORD, from experience in East and West Africa, said that the view that "there is no such thing as African opinion" was some 40 or 50 years out of date. Africans had two qualities that were very dear to their hearts - justice and loyalty. "I do not think they would consider it just that this scheme should be imposed upon them.. I feel sure that they would regard us as being disloyal to our trust if we were to weaken the connection which subsists between them and the Colonial Office... I suggest that it might be possible for the advocates of federation to be content for five years with something on the lines of the East African High Commission; that each of the territories should restrict immigration and take stronger measures for the protection of African land; that in Southern Rhodesia trade unions should be recognised; that the property qualification for voting should be reduced; that African representatives should be admitted and their numbers gradually increased in the territorial legislatures.... I believe.. that then federation might come, not as the root of partnership, but as its fruit."

LORD NOEL-BUXTON said "If federation is pressed through in the present circumstances I believe that we shall lose the confidence of Africa for ever, because what happens in this particular part of Africa will have wide and far-reaching influence."

by

LORD HAILEY asked "Why do you not begin amalgamating, or it may be federating, Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland?... You would have this advantage.. that you would enable the people of Africa mostly concerned to have some little experience of a union of that kind in its actual working." He had not been able to find out why the question of federation was so urgent and pointed out that "The matters of real importance to Africans are likely to arise much more in the executive and administrative field than they do in the legislative field. That was certainly our experience in India... If I read the White Paper proposals correctly, if there is a conflict of authority between the Federal and the Territorial Governments, then it is the decision of the Federal Government that would prevail, not only in legislative action but in administrative and executive action." Commenting on the 'vexed' question of a differentiating measure, LORD HAILEY pointed out that "you can have a measure of differentiation which is concealed - that is to say, you can have legislation which applies to all communities alike but affects only one." He later described the African representatives on the Protectorate and Representative Councils as "a body of responsible, respectable and intelligent opinion - by no means of the agitator type, but highly moderate in its form of expression."

4. REACTIONS TO THE WHITE PAPER ON FEDERATION

(a) Comments in Central Africa

In the course of an address delivered on June 30 SIR GODFREY HUGGINS denied that the proposed federal assembly would become an all-black Parliament. He added, "There is no reason why there should be any more Africans until the Federal Parliament amends the law. They will not have any more Africans in until the Europeans in that Parliament are satisfied that they ought to have more in. By that stage we shall have grown so much that we shall have a bigger Parliament. It can go black only when the whites in that Parliament increase it." He continued "I am one of those who believe that the Europeans cannot remain in Africa unless they can carry the indigenous Africans with them. If they work together there is no reason why our descendants should not remain here indefinitely. But, if you are going to refuse to allow them to take any part at all in the government of their country, then it is only a matter of time when your descendants will be pushed out of Africa altogether... It is no great hardship on the people of Southern Rhodesia to let the African people have a foot on the ladder." As reported in The Rhodesia Herald, 1 July, he also said, "I believe that the thing that is going to wreck this scheme is the so-called African Affairs Board. It is very difficult for me to criticise it because, if I present it to you in the light I want you to see it, it is presenting it to the Left Wing of the House of Commons in a dark light."

MR. RAY STOCKIL, M.P. (leader of the Opposition in the Southern Rhodesian Parliament) in an address at Marlborough on June 27, said that there was no natural demand from the people of Southern Rhodesia for federation and he thought Southern Rhodesia should consider carefully the proposals for federation before rushing into support of the Draft Federal Scheme. He did not believe that if, in future, Natives on the common roll became an embarrassment they could be removed. There were no safeguards in the federation proposals for the Europeans. "We need protection against some of the politicians in the United Kingdom." Mr. STOCKIL also asked the Prime Minister to suspend all further discussions on federation and to approach it from a different angle. "Africa was becoming more and more important strategically, he said, and if discussions were carried on at the highest possible level "we will get the terms we know to be in the best interests of Africa".

The Central Africa Post in its leading article on May 29 examined the economic arguments in favour of federation and suggested that these were not all that they appeared to be. It commented "We do not think that Railway development will be any faster under Federation since there is already a Joint Railway Board. Nor do we think that our hydro-electric schemes need suffer because we are not federated. As for tobacco, we could have our own floors in Lusaka and again for cattle, one need only ask 'Who is going to raise and rear the cattle, Africans or Europeans?'" The paper went on to say, "The great appeal of federation is not economic at all, at any rate in the meantime, but political. The gulf between British and European Colonial settlement has widened. The latter is not less liberal than the former, and it is more realistic. It has no intention of being thwarted of self-government until Africans are capable of sharing in it. At the same time it will aid and abet the African to attain the same cultural and political level as it has achieved. We Europeans resent the ignorant captious criticism of people in Britain and we resent their interference in our affairs."

(b) African Opinion

Information from various correspondents in Central Africa shows that African opposition to the new federal proposals is as adamant as it has always been. One correspondent, writing to the Africa Bureau from Blantyre, says that the Chiefs District Council meeting on June 18 discussed the White Paper and after the District Commissioner was closely questioned the meeting was adjourned until the 19th, when it was resolved that the people should not agree to discuss the White Paper until the four official members from Nyasaland who had boycotted the London conference were given an opportunity of reporting back to the Protectorate Council on their visit to Britain.

At a meeting/...

At a meeting at Zomba it was unanimously agreed to put forward as an alternative to Federation a scheme for self-government by the Africans. Mr. O.E. CHIRWA, one of the unofficial members of the Nyasaland African Congress delegation to Britain, was asked to draft a constitutional scheme to provide for self-government.

MR. J.R.N. CHINYAMA, President General of the Nyasaland African Congress, commenting on the White Paper on June 23, at Kaimba, said that "if the British Government wishes to retain her reputation as a Christian Government they will not try and impose federation on the Africans". He added that the Africans had no desire to make any further use of the White Paper.

In Northern Rhodesia, Mr. H.N. NKUMBULA, President of the African Congress, said at a public meeting held at the Mapoloto African Township, Lusaka, on 26 June, that "we are being betrayed by the British Government and it is high time that we tell the white people in this country that the support of this plan is not only dangerous to us, but to their well-being and happiness in this country. This is our country. There is no mistake about that. I have time and again stated that imposition of this scheme against the wishes of six million Africans will make life intolerable for the Whites in Central Africa. I cannot say anything more about this." He also said that he had come to the conclusion that the best government for the black people was a government fully manned and run by the black people themselves. He outlined a series of objections to the federal proposals in the course of which he said, "The African Affairs Board as provided under the draft Federal scheme cannot possibly be a safeguard for the Africans' interests because, in the first place, the members of the Board will not be elected by the people whose interest it shall protect."

Writing to the Africa Bureau from Salisbury, MR. E.M. MTEFUKA (a member of the Nyasaland unofficial delegation that visited Britain) says, "Africans are greatly perturbed, and although the matter has not been finally decided, statements made by British Ministers in support of the scheme are causing considerable anxiety. There is evidence that if the British Government and Parliament surrender their trust to the European settlers in Central Africa, and the British public condones that surrender, the Africans will, in sheer desperation, appeal elsewhere for help. They may even go to the United Nations... It would be infinitely wise not to rush the scheme. There are signs that if the question were left in abeyance for some time, to allow tempers to cool, it might receive favourable consideration, provided that it were altered to give practical effect to the principle of partnership. The proposed constitution for Tanganyika, which provides for equal racial representation, has caught the imagination of many thinking Africans here. If the federal constitution for Central Africa included, among other provisions, equal numbers of African and European representatives, the Africans' attitude to it would not have been what it is."

(c) South African Opinion

MR. ERIC LOUW, (Minister of Economic Affairs) said in Salisbury that the future of Southern Rhodesia was entirely its own affair and no South African holding a responsible position would presume even to express an opinion, much less to interfere. South Africans were watching the federation discussions with sympathy, "because we in South Africa cannot but view with sympathy any arrangement which would have the effect of furthering the interests of the European inhabitants of these territories."

The Rand Daily Mail, in an editorial on June 20, said: "The Europeans of the three territories earnestly desire Federation, but their chief motive in doing so is the hope that, when the Federation is established they will be able to carry out their own Native policy as they think fit, without any interference from outside. Since their views on Native policy differ radically from those of any conceivable British Government, there is here an inevitable conflict... It is in the light of that conflict that the present proposals must be viewed. How far are these proposed safeguards likely to be effective? With regard to the Queen's veto, we should say not at all. For thirty years certain matters have been 'reserved' in/...

"reserved" in Southern Rhodesia, for approval or disapproval by the British Government. In that period a number of discriminatory measures have been passed, but not one has been disallowed... The provision of a two-thirds majority does not appear much more practical, for a two-thirds majority could be obtained against the vote of the African representatives, and any measure could be carried by the Europeans against the wishes of the African people. The only real safeguard, indeed, seems to be the African Affairs Board... It is for this reason that we expect the main trend of European criticism to be directed against it."

(d) West African Opinion

British policy in South and Central Africa has been the subject of vigorous criticism in newspapers of all shades of opinion. The Spectator Daily (Accra) in a leading article (11 June) wrote: "It will be in the interest of the Gold Coast African if he takes greater interest in what is happening today in Central Africa. There, the British are aiding to set up Malan's second empire, after his pattern of South Africa. To protect their own frontiers against aggression, West Africans should push their political boundary to the Rhodesias where the Ruggins Government is making a supreme effort to establish a federated State of three British Territories. Ashantis are very much alive today; they have been the first to protest to the British Government against the Federation in Central Africa; in that the AYA (Ashanti Youth Association) has presented a strong protest to the British Government condemning the Federation system suggested for the two Rhodesias and Nyasaland. Political bodies in the Gold Coast whose ideas are not merely parochial are bound to hold sway over the people's mind, and politicians who wish to move forward should govern themselves accordingly."

The Eastern States Express (Aba) in a leading article (30 May) said: "In actual fact, we see with the West African Students' Union that this sort of federation will not be in the best interest of the Africans; It will lend support to Dr. Malan's racial policy and is likely to give rise to a situation which now arises in South Africa where democracy and justice are a farce... In fairness to all the nations of the Commonwealth we are today joining those who oppose this plan to advise Her Majesty's Government not to proceed any farther with this scheme."

These two leading articles are typical of a large number that have appeared in many papers over the past three months.

The London journal West Africa, in a leading article (28 June) opposed federation. In the course of its analysis of the federal proposals, the paper said: "It is fashionable to speak of African opposition as being that of an unrepresentative minority, and of opposition in Britain as being that of a handful of 'left-wing' politicians. In fact every African in Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland capable of understanding the issues is opposed to federation. If, as is truly asserted by the advocates of federation, the great majority do not understand the issues, the advocates must be consistent and pay attention only to those who do understand, and treat the rest as really neutral, i.e. not as people who would support federation if they understood it."

(e) British Press Opinion

Federation has been a subject of wide discussion and controversy in the British press. Most of the leading British papers devoted leading articles to the White Paper on federation. The Times, Manchester Guardian, the Scotsman and the Listener have published vigorous controversies in their letter columns.

The Economist (21 June) said: "But even if the new proposals pass every test, even if they are both morally acceptable and practicable, it is still not clear that they are really necessary. If opinion in Central Africa were in favour of federation or lukewarm about it, enough economic and political reasons could be mustered to justify the scheme, and a new and interesting chapter in British constitutional experiments would have been written. But the reverse is the case. In the last twelve months African opposition to federation has been unmistakable. It is no use pretending that this opposition is unreal because a few African politicians are by this/...

"are by this means furthering their own interests. From nearly all accounts, the opposition is universal; it may be instinctive, without any basis in either study or understanding of the proposals, but it nevertheless cannot be ignored." It concluded by saying that until the case for federation "is made clear beyond doubt, any attempt to force it on the Africans will be mistaken."

The Scotsman (3 July) said; "Whether the fears and suspicions of the Africans are right or wrong, the fact that these exist is an argument against rushing ahead with federation, without making more strenuous efforts to allay native apprehensions."

The Manchester Guardian (19 June) said: "This scheme has one serious, potentially a fatal, shortcoming. In a part of Africa now in rapid social transition, it would erect a political structure which does not unfairly represent the present equilibrium, but which will before long be out of date and which - this is the core of the problem - no internal force will have at once the will and the constitutional power to amend to meet the realities of a new situation."

The Daily Telegraph (19 June) said: "If the Government is wise it will ignore these disingenuous counsels: (from a vacillating group in Southern Rhodesia and native leaders) and prosecute its plans as energetically as possible. It cannot command success; but it can deserve it."

The Times (19 June) published an article by Dr. MAX BELOFF examining the federal proposals in which he said, "In the long run the future of the African can be secured only by institutions which make it certain that he is not debarred by any artificial form of exclusion from a full participation in the increasing opportunities which should be open in what the White Paper describes as 'the rightful home' of all its lawful inhabitants 'whatever their origin'. And in the longer run still, the European population, destined as it must be to remain a minority, has everything to gain from a peaceful and ordered progress towards an ultimate partnership."

In a leading article the Times (19 June) said: "The proposed constitution goes a long way to meet the views of the advocates of amalgamation. At the same time a Board of African Affairs is set up to meet the fears that so powerful a central authority may threaten the liberties now enjoyed by Africans or to which they aspire."

PROFESSOR S.H. FRANKEL, in a letter to the Times (2 July), after pointing out the fundamental weakness of the African Affairs Board in being able only to advise and criticise, suggests "that the board be empowered to establish an African development authority...The underlying purpose of my suggestion is that federal African development should become a functional activity entrusted to a body financially sufficiently independent to be able to act with continuity and with long-run purpose."

The REV. MICHAEL SCOTT in a letter to the Times (25 June) raised the question of Government officials being made "advocates and propagandists" of the Federal scheme. "If the machinery of government and the recognised vehicles of African opinion are to be used to gain approval for a scheme which they have emphatically rejected, how are the African people intended, henceforth, to make their opinions known? It would be folly to leave them no other recourse than agitation or direct action."

MR. J.H. WALLACE (Secretary of the London Committee, United Central Africa Association, replied (3 July) that "district officers have been accustomed for many years to the task of explaining Government policy and measures and at the same time reporting African reaction to the Central Government, whether favourable or unfavourable."

On 5 July Mr. SCOTT wrote "From time to time it is true that district officers are called upon to advocate a Government policy which may or may not be popular... But the proposed federal scheme is not a matter of routine administration, but one of far-reaching constitutional change affecting the status of the inhabitants of these territories and their relationship with this country. Moreover, the federation scheme is not yet an accepted/...

"an accepted policy of the British Government and people." He asked "What will be the position of the district officers if African opinion is still not persuaded, if the Government should decide for whatever reason not to proceed with the scheme?... It would be deplorable if the district officers were themselves to become discredited among the African people..."

MR. WALLACE (11 July) wrote, "If Mr. Scott had been to Northern Rhodesia and knew the facts of the situation from personal experience, he would not have drawn a false distinction between 'a matter of routine administration' and 'one of far-reaching constitutional change'. No experienced administrator would dare to place the dividing line..." He continues that the district officers "will explain not that the federation scheme involves a change 'affecting the status of the inhabitants and their relationships with this country', but the strength of the safeguards in it..."

Subsequently, replying to Colonel Dodds-Parker M.P. and Mr. Wallace, MR. SCOTT wrote (17 July), "as regards the present plans for a Central African federation, I oppose them because I think that they place the safeguarding of African rights too much in the hands of other than African people, and that they do not allow the Africans enough opportunity both to judge for themselves what is in their best interests and to take a positive part in the development of their territories by participating in its administration... Once substantial power has been transferred into the hands of a settler community it becomes, as Lord Lugard pointed out, virtually impossible for Whitehall or Westminster to retain or resume the power of veto."

MRS. EIRENE WHITE M.P. on 21 July wrote, "If (the Central African Federation proposal) is adopted, those at Westminster who vote for it will resign the political future of the six million or so Africans in the three territories, so far as the Federal Government is concerned, to a Government heavily weighted in favour of Europeans.... The White Paper had a mixed reception in the House of Lords and it has not yet been debated in the House of Commons. One may therefore question the propriety of using Government officials to 'explain... the strength of the safeguards', when many persons in Parliament and the country have yet to be convinced of their adequacy..."

The Scotsman published a long letter from MR. SINCLAIR SHAW Q.C. (7 July) whose conclusions are that "If the proposals in the White Paper are given effect to, the result will be to hand over an overwhelming African majority to the tender mercies of a tiny minority of Europeans. No minority, whatever its racial origins, can safely be entrusted with such powers. The only safe course for Britain is either to drop the whole idea of federation for some years, or alternatively, to require that half the seats in the Federal Assembly are allotted now to Africans, or are reserved for their occupation within a sharply defined period."

On July 8, DR. KENNETH LITTLE, replying to a letter by Mr. WALLACE, in the Scotsman wrote, "I thank Mr. Wallace for his fuller exposition of 'partnership', although it hardly contains the kind of specific assurance I had hoped for. The expressed intentions are excellent, but how are we to reconcile them with the existing reality of a society, many of whose members are bitterly opposed to any substantial change in the African's position?... There are already Africans possessing as much industrial skill and experience as European workers. What more must such Africans accomplish in order to 'earn' similar opportunities of employment and wages as European workers?... What of those Africans who are already as educated as many Europeans? Why must they be excluded from European hotels and clubs, and obliged to use separate entrances in stores, etc.?"

On 13 July, the Observer in a leading article said: "Neither white nor black supremacy is a solution. There must be a compromise that will allow the African population inalienable rights and opportunities for advancement, while equally safeguarding the rights of the small European minority. Both communities feel a need of protection, that is to say are frightened. Each needs the other for its own development - but tends to overlook this through fear. The proper role of the British Government is to see that the two communities (or two sections of one community) are protected, and to encourage them to recognise each other's value: it is certainly not its duty to back one community against the other."

5. WEST AFRICA - COMMENTS ON A SERIES OF ARTICLES ON THE GOLD COAST
APPEARING IN "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH"

The Daily Telegraph (in its issues of 20, 21, and 30 June and 10 July) has published a series of articles on the Gold Coast by its special correspondent, Eric Downton. These, while mentioning some of the achievements of the present Gold Coast Government, are highly critical of Dr. Nkrumah and his colleagues of the Convention People's Party, who are described in a headline as "dubious guardians of a state floundering towards self-government".

It is healthy that a government should receive press criticism, especially a government which is not faced by a strong opposition in the legislature; and some of Mr. Downton's criticisms are justified. For example, it is difficult to defend the Prime Minister's taking part in the welcome given, on their release from gaol, to the two members of the Legislative Assembly who had been imprisoned for attempting to intimidate a magistrate; if two football players were sent off the field for threatening the referee, they ought not to be applauded on their return by their captain. There is no doubt that, as Mr. Downton says, many Gold Coast politicians are immature. Any friend of the Gold Coast people must also hope that they will set their faces against the corruption which is all too common among them.

While, however, there are truths in Mr. Downton's reports, there is also a general lack of proportion and of understanding. How surprising it would be if there were not many immature politicians in a country so young politically as the Gold Coast is! What miracle-workers the present Government would be if they had eradicated age-long corruption in less than 18 months! There is no evidence that members of the Government have themselves been guilty of corruption.

Such truth as Mr. Downton's account of Gold Coast politics contains is the truth of a caricature rather than of a portrait. Even as a caricature it is poor. While stressing unduly the opinions of British business-men, it repeatedly belittles those of the British officials, who have the best opportunity of judging the success of the new Constitution. Much is made of Nkrumah's "past flirtations with Communism"; little of the moderation which has marked so many of his recent utterances. "He is said to nourish ambitions for a West African republic"; but his "assurances that the Gold Coast will stay within the Commonwealth" are "accepted with reserve" by "British business-men and members of the gold-mining industry."

The logical, fair-minded, reader of Mr. Downton's articles will wonder whether "the co-ercive methods" of the C.P.P. can be very serious if opposition to the C.P.P. is growing. He will be less impressed by the reported views of British business-men and members of the gold-mining industry than by Mr. Downton's list of "the excellent work so far achieved:

"The Africanisation of the Civil Service has been accelerated.
Work proceeds on schools, hospitals, agricultural schemes, housing projects, new harbours, roads and railways. Swollen shoot, a disease threatening the vital cocoa industry, is being mastered."

He will probably reject Mr. Downton's conclusion that "judging by present conditions, it must be many years before the Gold Coast is fit to govern itself", and will agree with the senior officials who say that "the results so far in preparing Gold Coast Africans to rule themselves are encouraging."

Hemingford.

